

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/723,273	BARRETT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	NIHIR PATEL	3772	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) NIHIR PATEL.

(2) James M. Heslin.

**Date of Interview:** 3 February 2010

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*N/A*

Claims discussed:

*18-21, 31 and 32*

Prior art documents discussed:

*N/A*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See attached sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** 3:00 PM

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

A phone call was made to applicant's attorney, Fred C. Hernandez on January 26<sup>th</sup>, 2010, the applicant indicated that he is no longer on the case. The examiner then called the current applicant's attorney James M. Heslin on January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2010. The applicant's attorney was not available so the examiner left a voice mail stating that application 10/723,273 looks allowable the only issues are claims 18-21, 31 and 32 and that the applicant contact the examiner as soon as possible. On February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2010, the examiner called the applicant's attorney James M. Heslin and discussed that the current application looks allowable with the exception of claims 18-21, 31 and 32. Claims 18-21, 31 and 32 recite limitations specifically "an ejection member movably disposed in the housing wherein the ejection member is completely prevented from moving outside of the housing" not disclosed in the applicant's specification. The examiner pointed out to paragraph [0064] which recites that Figs. 9 and 10A shows ejection member which is a flange 910 positioned outside of the housing 850. The applicant's attorney indicated he would contact the applicant and let the examiner know what next step to take. On February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2010, the applicant's attorney called and left a voice mail indicating that the applicant's has agreed to cancel claims 18-21, 31 and 32.